DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 414 CS 511 928

AUTHOR	Cicalese, Carla
TITLE	Children's Perspectives on Interactive Writing versus Independent Writing in Primary Grades.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	64p.; M.A. Research Project, Kean University. Published material in the appendixes are not available from ERIC. Several pages of the appendixes contain images that may not reproduce adequately.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Childrens Writing; Classroom Environment; Collaborative Writing; *Instructional Effectiveness; Primary Education; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Attitudes; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS	*Interactive Writing

ABSTRACT

The research exploring children's perspectives on interactive writing versus independent writing was examined. Studies were analyzed to determine the perspectives of students toward writing when they experienced an interactive writing event and when they did not share this experience. Since interactive writing is a collaborative group writing experience which produces an authentic writing piece composed and constructed by the students, positive perspectives were encountered as a result of a sociocultural classroom environment. The knowledge of language conventions resulting from independent writing activities was examined and compared to the use of language conventions resulting from the unique experience of "sharing the pen" in interactive writing. Children became more confident risk-takers when they were actively engaged in their writing. They viewed their errors as learning-in-progress and made significant gains from their errors. Strategies of interactive word walls and engaging learning centers were also examined. The research supported interactive writing as an essential first-step to independent writing. It was also determined that further research is needed to follow the change in students' perspectives toward writing as they advance through the grades. Emergent writers held more positive perspectives toward writing when they first experienced interactive writing events. Children were more successful in writing when interactive writing was used as a scaffold on their journey toward proficient literacy development. Appendixes contain: Writing Assessment for Grade 1-2: Writing Samples; Registered Holistic Scoring Method for K-2 Students; "Writing Attitude Survey" (published in "Reading Teacher" v54 n1 p16-19 Sep 2000); and images and data from the study. (Contains 61 references.) (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 414

Children's Perspectives on Interactive Writing versus Independent Writing in Primary Grades

Carla Cicalese

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Master of Arts Degree in
Reading Specialization
Kean University

April 2003

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Cicalese

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 511 928

Abstract

The research exploring children's perspectives on interactive writing versus independent writing was examined. Studies were analyzed to determine the perspectives of students toward writing when they experienced an interactive writing event and when they did not share this experience. Since interactive writing is a collaborative group writing experience which produces an authentic writing piece composed and constructed by the students, positive perspectives were encountered as a result of a sociocultural classroom environment. The knowledge of language conventions resulting from independent writing activities was examined and compared to the use of language conventions resulting from the unique experience of "sharing the pen" in interactive writing. Children became more confident risk-takers when they were actively engaged in their writing. They viewed their errors as learning-in-progress and made significant gains from their errors. Strategies of interactive word walls and engaging learning centers were also examined. The research supported interactive writing as an essential first-step to independent writing. It was also determined that further research is needed to follow the change in students' perspectives toward writing as they advance through the grades. Emergent writers held more positive perspectives toward writing when they first experienced interactive writing events. Children were more successful in writing when interactive writing was used as a scaffold on their journey toward proficient literacy development.

Children's Perspectives on Interactive Writing

Versus Independent Writing

National Crisis – Relationship of Reading and Writing

American schools face an alarming crisis. The United States Department of Education Reading Summit (1998) reports that four out of every ten fourth graders cannot read proficiently, and, therefore, do not achieve high academic standards. The educational consequences of this data are serious and potentially dangerous to all aspects of society. Literacy demands have become increasingly more significant in the workplace and the nation's students who are at-risk in the educational institutions will ultimately experience difficulty obtaining, maintaining and sustaining employment.

The National Research Council (NRC) commissioned by the United States Department of Education and Health and Human Services (1998) summarized essential elements to diffuse this national crisis. The synthesis of the research to support "an integrated picture of how reading develops and how reading instruction should proceed" provides evidence that an important vehicle necessary to increase letter knowledge and phonological awareness is writing.

This research, summarized in "Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children," reports that invented spelling encourages great awareness of the smallest units of sounds and enables children to use recognizable letters in their writing. The use of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

invented spelling is significant to demonstrate knowledge of the sound structure of language and the conventions of language within a print rich, social environment conducive to language development. These skills and attitudes are the foundation to developing proficiency in writing.

Writing is a complex process, some aspects of which cause particular difficulties for children (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower, 1989, Hayes & Flower, 1986). It is usually a solitary activity lacking interaction and dialogue which social interactionist theorists such as Vygotsky (1962,1978) consider crucial for learning. Another area of difficulty is limited metacognitive knowledge and control (Englert & Raphael, 1988). Children may lack awareness of appropriate strategies and have difficulty exercising control over implementing and monitoring them. When children make the transition from spoken to written communication, they often undergo difficulties due to the lack of external feedback (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). Both verbal and nonverbal signals from partners constantly stimulate and modify language production, but in the case of writing, language production usually has to be sustained by internal processes.

The research of Yarrow & Topping (2001) found that in a study of 28 ten and eleven year old students with interaction and no interaction conditions, the interaction writers produced significantly greater gains than those of the individual writers. The observations of the interaction in pairs indicated that the children accepted the support from their helpers, questioned, reassured, praised and kept each other on task. The

findings indicate that the conditions (No Interaction and Interaction) showed statistically notable results in the effects of metacognitive prompting and structured peer interaction.

Interactive Writing

Emergent readers and writers are successful when they practice language and literacy-related skills in a playful and motivating setting. The early grade teachers must provide the best environment for cognitive, social and language development. Preschool, Kindergarten and first-grade teachers must also use children's writing to analyze phonemic awareness and inform instruction accordingly. Teacher attitude toward assessing student needs and planning teacher moves influences how children respond to errors (Henry and Wiley 1999).

Analyzing literacy development and assessing performance provide the instructor with the responsibility to make decisions to meet the individual needs of the students. In 1991 a group of educators at The Ohio State University coined the term "interactive writing," an approach to help young children understand how words work (McCarrier, Pinnell & Fountas 2000). The group was experienced in using their observations of children to make teaching decisions and adopted the approach as a powerful instructional prompt to help children understand the writing process. The research group defined the place of interactive writing in the curriculum and the way it differed from the traditional language experience approach, shared writing and independent writing. Other research by Jones (1998) supports the findings that interaction elicits use of metacognitive and metalinguistic language. The research examined the role of close

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

relationships in the process of early literacy learning. The study observed the relationships of interactants and the consequences these friendships had on the development of early writing. The role of social context and social interaction in children's cognitive development is well established (Wertsch 1985) and peer influences on cognitive development are often based on Piaget's (1983) equilibration theory where the conceptual conflict characteristic of complementary relations promotes cognitive development.

Interaction with peers results in conflict, conflict resolution and cognitive growth. This is evidenced in research, which showed the language of young children's literacy events was characterized by conceptual conflict and resolution and subsequent talk about cognitive and linguistic processes (Pellegrini, Galda & Flor 1997). Researchers have begun to examine the role of close relationships and friendships in the process of early literacy learning. (Daiute & Dalton 1993; Daiute, Hartup, Sholl & Zajac 1993; Jones & Pellegrini 1996). It is believed that the role of interaction through peer relationships in the context of writing may be significant. Interacting with friends during writing activities might enable students to "go meta" on the task and generate more cohesive texts.

As children's writing is often accompanied by self-talk and descriptive, reflective, social conversation (Graves 1983), it is predicted that interacting with a friend during writing would promote use of metacognitive language (e.g. I think, know,

guess etc.). Interaction with friends and subsequently, the ability to compose written text would be apparent in emergent writers as they are developing key concepts about writing. This event is lacking in solitary independent writing activities.

Student and Teacher Perspectives

Another significant condition between interactive writing and independent writing that was examined is how teachers respond to children's mistakes. Henry & Wiley (1999) found that when teachers convey to children that they are problem-finders and problem-solvers, their feelings are not hurt when mistakes occur. The students look at mistakes as learning-in-progress. The fix-it-tape used in the interactive writing approach is perceived as a helpful tool that writers need to lead them toward accurate work. Teachers who are sensitive to responding to errors shape how children evaluate their work and how they perceive their progress.

In Sharon Esswein's kindergarten classroom in Etna Road School, Whitehall, Ohio, the message is conveyed that noticing one's errors and fixing them are integral parts of their learning together. For example, when student Cody noticed that the letter formation of the N was incorrect, she reported that she was worried about the letter since the line needed to go to the bottom. The teacher responded, "OK, Let's help Brian fix it up. Start right here and go clear down there. Great. You made it touch here. Can you make it touch up there?" (Henry & Wiley 1999). The teacher celebrated the

contribution, although not quite correct, and encouraged the engagement and risk-taking of the students. This has been found to support further learning.

Children's perspectives are an integral component to the success of the interactive writing approach. It is intended to be a collaborative group writing experience, which produces an authentic, writing product. It also provides an opportunity for students to practice early writing behaviors and gain knowledge of language conventions in a supported learning environment. One of the values of interactive writing is in its collaboration and conversation (McCarrier, Fountas, & Pinnell, 2000).

Interactive Writing is described by Pinnel & Fountas (1998) as "sharing the pen." This conviction of allowing children to tell the teacher what to write and offering them to "share the pen" is different from watching the teacher write. Students pay more attention to the writing when they are an integral part of it. When the students are actively engaged in their writing, their perspectives on writing are more positive.

This notion is further supported in a study conducted by Bickel, Holsopple, Garcia, Lantz & Yoder (1999). The researchers collected samples of children's independent writing, interactive writing, student reflection sheets, individual conferencing and observational surveys. The results indicated that the 26 students observed in Kindergarten were amazed at the changes in their writing from August to October and from December to March. One student commented, "I didn't know I could write this good!" Other students said, "Now I can proof-read," I don't scribble no more!" "I write longer sentences, now my sentences make sense," "I can read my sentences."

Their perspectives toward writing were developing and their interactive writing experiences enabled them to commence on a positive foot.

The study continues to report that the students were surprised to see their early writing samples and were proud and excited about their work now. Some supportive comments that the Kindergarten students made were, "We didn't use that much tape today." "I can write the whole word by myself now." "I know how to write "doing" because it is like the i-n-g in living."

The children's perspectives toward writing were positive. They were not afraid to take a risk: they were willing to try and spell the word. The examiner also reported that the students were paying attention to the conventions of print. They were starting sentences with a capital letter, left to right and top to bottom, leaving a space between words and using a period. Some children even dated their writing pieces. Some students struggled with picture writing and writing random letters to convey their message but they had the confidence to attempt to write on their own.

Independent writing, in contrast, allows the child to work alone using his prior knowledge and experiential background to compose and construct the text. The student chooses his own topic and works with limited support. However, several studies indicate that independent writing experiences may also contribute to generating negative attitudes toward writing. Kear, Coffman, McKenna and Ambrosio (2000) found that there are long range effects stemming from independent journal writing trends. For example, children may have experienced lack of choice, negative feedback and tedious assignments.

In addition, the collection of data indicates that positive attitudes toward writing diminish as the students move upward in the grades. The Writing Attitude Survey is offered as a measure of monitoring attitudes and as a tool for monitoring the affective growth in student performance.

Phonological Awareness, Letter Knowledge, Invented Spelling

Independent journal entries also demonstrate the developmental progression of writing. Mary Jo Fresch (2000) examined one child's kindergarten through fourth-grade journal entries in relation to her spelling knowledge. During Kindergarten, Jen wrote her entries and then read them to the teacher, who acted as a scribe providing the conventional spellings as needed. Jen created 99 entries, 46 of which were illustrated; she began the school year in the phonetic stage, as she was aware of the difference between letters of the alphabet and simple scribbles. The entries were a string of letters representing one sentence. She began placing spaces between her letters and then moved into the letter name stage.

During first grade, Jen wrote 72 entries and displayed a solid understanding of word capitalization, punctuation and sight vocabulary. By the middle of grade one, Jen continued mixing short-vowel sounds and switching homonym spellings. She also demonstrated understanding of how to mark long vowels and an increase in the number of sight words. Although many spelling attempts were close to convention, Jen

continued to show signs of the phonetic stage as she left out some sounds. Her journals became self-generated windows to see what spelling knowledge had been internalized and what vocabulary was personally selected.

While independent writing serves as a valuable tool to inform instructional planning, the gains made in independent writing as a result of interactive writing may be more significant. While this research study depicts the progression of language development through independent journal writing, it is necessary to further examine if the journals would have evidenced more conventions of language had interactive writing been practiced.

Mary Rubadue (2002) examined interactive writing and independent writing in her kindergarten class at Hanby Elementary School in Westerville, Ohio. The kindergarten children were hesitant writers; they either wanted to draw or have the teacher spell the words. They were unwilling to make an attempt at spelling on their own. It was frustrating for both teacher and students; it was challenging to get them to become risk-takers on the journey to becoming writers.

After recommitting to the research that children learn best in a whole, meaningful, interesting and functional atmosphere, Rubadue analyzed the instructional strategies of interactive writing which conceptualize written language as best acquired in the context of meaningful activities, which actively engage the students.

Rubadue (2002) writes "sharing the pen" made a big impact on my students this past year. It gave them the opportunity to associate letters with sounds. They were doing more of the writing; they were engaged in the activity, which helped them to become better at segmenting sounds in words. It also gave them ownership and encouraged the possibility of re-creating writing independently on their own. As they wrote in their journals, they were constantly experimenting with written language. It was "sharing the pen," I believe that made the difference."

In a study of "Children's Name Writing and Literacy Acquisition," Bloodgood (1999) discusses the value of name recognition for early literacy learners. The study examined the classroom interactions of sixty-seven 3-, 4-, and 5- years olds and the correlation of their name recognition. Name recognition and name production produced relationships with alphabet knowledge, word recognition and concept of word. Automatic name writing paralleled control of the alphabet, recognition of several sight words and literacy connections. Clay (1975) and Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982) described how children manipulate a number of literacy theories before coming to a sound-to-letter hypothesis.

Clay (1991) also examined children's name writing competence focusing on the form and function of print and new understandings emerged as children experimented with concepts of direction, recursion and flexibility. The conclusion was that there is a generalized progression of namewriting proficiency and literacy abilities with age.

Children's perceptions of how their name is represented in print and how it can be read served as an important window for their understanding of written language (Ferreiro, 1984, 1985a, 1985b; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Hardy, 1982).

The most effective teaching of writing may incorporate instructional components of alphabetic principle, reflective discussion and composing practice. It is not sufficient to push emerging writers along their zone of proximal development in the quality of composing without scaffolding the process. In "Teaching Spelling and Composition, Alone and Together," Berninger and Vaughn noted that a specific instructional component like spelling is most effective when combined with composing to increase both spelling and composing fluency.

Sociocognitive/ Sociocultural Environment

It was also argued by Vygotsky (1978) that through interaction children can develop advanced mental processes such as awareness of audience and the ability to anticipate audience needs. Research by Wollman-Bonilla (2001) finds that the use of Family Message Journals provide a situation that may extend children's independent sociocognitive limits because they provide a purposeful dialogue with regular feedback from families and therefore, expand children's perspectives.

Wollman-Bonilla (2001) focused her study in a classroom which was socially supported both at home and in school. The children were writing for a real audience and an authentic social purpose. The data included how the interaction with home and school might shape children's writing development. The findings conclude that through dialogue and sociocultural conventions, emergent writers can become aware of their audience despite arguments that young children don't have the sociocognitive capacity to anticipate readers' beliefs and expectations. The social context in which the first-graders were working was central to their positive writing gains

Another study by Lisa Brandt (2002) examined interactive writing through a sociocultural lens. Interactive writing is intended to be a collaborative group writing experience with an opportunity for children to practice early writing and reading behaviors in a supported learning environment. The writing is the ownership of the class and therefore it values all the students' responses before the message is written. Brandt writes, "This collaboration is a dynamic process and changes with every interactive writing experience. The environment the teacher creates during the interactive writing process should support risk-taking" (Button, Johnson & Ferguson, p. 449).

Constructivist researchers, Devries and Zanstate (1996) depict creating the environment for interactive writing:

> "The first principle of constructivist education is to establish a sociomoral atmosphere in which mutual respect is continuously practiced... In the context of interpersonal activities the child begins to think of him or herself as having characteristics in relation to others" (Fosnot, 1996, p. 103).

If learning is socially constructed, it is important that instruction be based on the power of relationships that exist within a classroom culture. It is the responsibility of the teacher to create this classroom cultural community which will enable the students to develop positive perspectives toward writing.

Peer culture is another aspect of the classroom culture that will either be accepted or rejected during the event of interactive writing. Brandt (2002) writes, "when peer culture is embraced during interactive writing, learners have the opportunity to incorporate full social membership and their individual positionings into a situated classroom structure. Interactive writing is an event, which fosters cooperative negotiation through collaboration; this is critical to the incorporation of peer culture."

Brandt summarizes her article through the same sociocultural lens, which she examined interactive writing. She theorizes that as sociocultural theories and perspectives make their way into educational practice, teachers will delve into self-examination of their personal philosophies on instruction, language and relationships in schools. She expresses enlightenment on decoding her views on interactive writing and recommits to the sociocultural theory, which will change the perspectives of teachers and students alike.

Interactive writing is a social situation in which students along with their teachers and peers negotiate the composition of texts, constructing words through analysis of sounds and using conventions of print to scaffold writing knowledge. Brandt views the event of interactive writing as a sociocultural perspective providing an opportunity to

view and interpret writing instruction and speculates that this perspective will provide insight into the idiosyncrasies that contribute to children's writing development.

The research examining the perceptions, understandings and performances of young writers during independent writing also provides insight into the characteristics of writing development. Bradley (2001) investigated the young writers' knowledge of the act of writing in three first-grade classrooms. The study explored what they thought made quality writing, what they would do to critically evaluate a peer's writing and what students believe about quality writing matches their performance as writers. Another aspect of the rationale is what teachers say and do in writing instruction is reflected in students' perceptions about writing.

Bradley's research showed evidence that 84% of the students offered sensible and age appropriate definitions of writing and said that they liked to write compared to 16% of the students who responded that they didn't like to write. These findings were informative but questionable against other findings. Kear, Coffman, McKenna & Ambrosio (2000) found that perceptions toward writing were more negative as the grade levels increased but since this data is limited to first grade students, an interesting follow-up would be an inquiry into the perceptions of the same participants as they progressed throughout the elementary grades.

Other findings in Bradley's (2001) study included student interest in appearance and correctness. The young writers were concerned with correct spelling and language conventions. Bradley also questions whether or not the teachers do what they reported and emphasizes the dramatically different perceptions of one first-grade class compared

to the other two classes. The difference was that one particular first-grade class was focused on the technical aspects of writing. Bradley concurred that the teacher also emphasized many technical aspects of writing during her interview. This finding supported Bradley's notion that what teachers do and say about writing is reflected in their students' perceptions; instruction influences first-grade students perceptions about writing. Emergent writers are in need of support from the teacher before they journey into independent writing events.

The research of Dorn, French and Jones further supports that what the child accomplishes today with the teacher's assistance, he or she will be able to accomplish independently tomorrow. This is based on the Vygotsky (1978) theory of the zone of proximal development and is a true measure of a learner's potential. By comparing writing samples over time, the teacher sees how a child is regulating his own writing. A balanced writing program reflects three types of support that build on one another; interactive writing, independent writing and individual conferences about writing. Progress is measured according to what the child is able to accomplish in the zone of proximal development with the assistance of a more knowledgeable person and what the child is able to accomplish in the zone of actual development without the help of another person.

This research further validates the benefit of interactive writing events before independent writing situations. Even while children write independently, the teacher

must nudge and prompt the child in a productive direction: "Say it slowly as you write it" or "That word starts like your name."

Relationship to Independent Writing

In order to monitor progress effectively, teachers must be able to analyze and interpret children's writing and spelling development. Teachers of emergent writers in kindergarten and early first grade generally follow their interactive writing activities with ten or fifteen minutes of independent writing. If a small group has been working on interactive writing, the teacher might arrange for follow-up independent work at literacy centers.

Ford and Opitz (2002) researched the value of centers and student perceptions toward writing. Their research supports the value of purposeful and meaningful literacy activities on successful student performance. They write, "students need to perceive not only that "I can do this! But also that the outcome will be valued... the challenge for teachers is knowing that students within one class vary quite significantly in their abilities to perceive success and in what outcomes they will value." They further discuss that all students deserve to be successful and that some need more support than others do.

Organizing centers for independent writing that operate with instructional density around multiple goals and outcomes after interactive writing experiences is one way to guarantee this success. The best way to engage children with text is to have them generate their own. The research of Ford and Optiz emphasizes critical thinking in terms

of writing demands. It describes writing as a form of response, an expression of thoughts, and a way to apply all known print conventions. The centers can be easily created by providing students with access to a variety of writing tools plus allowing for a variety of genres.

Richgels (2002) refers to a joint position statement, Learning to Read and Write: Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children (1998), the International Reading Association (IRA) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in which it was stated:

> "Recognizing the early beginnings of literacy acquisition too often has resulted in use of inappropriate teaching practices suited to older children or adults perhaps but ineffective with children in preschool, kindergarten, and the early grades... Young children especially need to be engaged in experiences that makes academic content meaningful and build on prior learning (p. 197).

Both the IRA and NAEYC contend that to experience vocabulary development, kindergartners need to be exposed to vocabulary from a wide variety of genres, including informational texts. Richgels(2002) based his case on a study by Guillaume (1998) who found that content area reading is not the sole territory of those who are already proficient readers. Also Duthie(1994) reported that her first-graders lacked appreciation for nonfiction. Both of these studies evidenced that even preschoolers have knowledge about the forms of written language. This knowledge includes mastery of word and letter level form conventions plus knowledge of format characteristics of nonnarrative texts.

The results of Richgel's study provide important guidelines based on Guillaume's (1998) study supporting kindergarten context. Guillaume provided 10 big ideas to inform complex and interactive literacy learning in kindergarten using informational text. Three especially important principles are (1) Provide access to content area materials (2) Read for a purpose and (3) Connect reading and writing. Richgels elaborated and illustrated these ideas as principles for using informational texts with kindergarten students.

Richgel (2002) observed three principles in a half-day kindergarten for 164 of the 174 school days. He participated with the teacher, Mrs. Poremba, in (1) using informational books with other informational text forms, with narrative texts and other media, (2) making kindergartners' experiences with informational texts functional and (3) engaging kindergartners in the reading and writing of informational text. The data included the collection of all journals, class-made books, and all writing-center writing.

The experiences of Mrs. Poremba and her kindergartners support the case for engaging students in interactive writing before independent writing, developing positive attitudes through successful writing events and achieving conventional literacy competence through early practice. The students also learned that informational texts were sources of both content knowledge and the workings of written language. Mrs. Poremba also demonstrated support for student initiative and social interactions during writing. Using informational texts in kindergarten is a powerful tool for creating positive perceptions of emergent writers to explore the means and ends of written language.

Interactive Word Walls

Another very powerful tool for exploring the structure of words is the arrangement and display of word walls. Word Walls assist the students in transferring responsibility and control for reading and writing from teacher to students (Brabham & Villaume 2001).

In "Building Walls of Words," Brabbam & Villaume (2001) write that word walls can be used to facilitate word analysis, spell commonly misspelled words, build vocabulary, promote detection of patterns and encourage connections between words. Word Walls display a visible record of skills taught and content studies and are valuable aids to both interactive and independent writing. They empower students to gain mileage in word structures by conserving space and selecting key anchor words that help beginning readers and writers

maximize what they know to figure out how to read and write the words they do not know.

Cunningham (2000) emphasizes that having a word wall is unproductive unless we are doing the word wall. Pinnell and Fountas(1998) highlight interactive word walls. For word walls to be effective for emergent readers, teachers must plan activities that invite students to develop deeper understandings of the relationships between letters and sounds; word walls must be used as springboards for reading and spelling. Powerful instruction using word walls occurs during conversations about word-solving problems as students read and write.

These conversations are scaffolds that support the development of chunking and decoding-by-analogy strategies. The example is used that when a child asks how to spell "feet", the teacher must point out the word "need" on the wall and ask if it can help. When a child stumbles on the word "right" as he/she reads/writes, the teacher must ask her to point out the word "night" on the wall to help solve the problem.

Pinnell and Fountas (1998) recommend energizing word study and maximizing attention by asking students to clap between words; alternate sitting and standing; write the words in the air, with letter tiles or shaving cream, or on dry erase boards. Word searches, I Spy and flash card games also promote word identification and connections to writing. When teachers see students glance at the word wall during independent writing and smile, they know that the students have successfully met the challenge of working interactively with the word wall. This triumph leads to positive perceptions toward writing and challenges teachers to continue to utilize word walls as scaffolds for literacy development.

Cunningham and Hall (1998) suggest that teachers make word walls to highlight common prefixes and suffixes and spelling patterns associated with these (doubling the consonant before adding the suffix). Words such as unfriendly and irresponsible support other words containing those morphemes. They also describe brand-name phonics word walls like Sprite, Coke, and Snack Pack as scaffolds for reading and spelling the words ignite, provoke and attacked.

There has been an abundance of professional conversation to ensure that word walls really function as visual and conversational scaffolds rather than as crutches. However, there is a need for continuation of the exploration of the use of word walls with readers and writers at different points in their development of literacy skills. Findings support that word walls hold much promise because they provide teachers with activities, materials and records that promote systematic instruction guided by the needs of the early learners.

Impact of Children's Perspectives on Need for Further Research

Findings also indicate that there is a need to review children's writing development from socio-cultural, generative and developmental perspectives. Mei-Yu Lu (2000) describes children's early writing as drawing and talk to support exploration and print. As children write, they weave their drawing and speech to convey meaning. Drawing and speech along with "make-believe play" present different moments in an essentially unified process of the development of the written language. Children's earliest conventional written words are usually their own names. They identify with their names and use them as a basis for further learning in writing. Signs, captions and labels are also important to emergent writers as they assume ownership of them and begin to use them in early writing

This research also discusses the changes in writing as children advance in

elementary school. This is a key component of this specific paper as one finding has been that children's perspectives toward writing change as they move upward in the grades. However, the studies also validate earlier findings by Clay (1975) that children explore with written language by playing with basic graphic features, such as the linearity of the print. Also Bissex (1980) observed her own son's writing and found that he mentally manipulated and played with the arrangement of word strings as he was writing a song or lying on the bed. She wrote this sample, "You spell book, B-O-O-K, To write look, you just change one letter—take away the B and add an L." This is a direct connection to the importance of letter-word relationships.

In Interactive writing, the teacher and children compose and then write, letter by letter, word by word, and a message, an informational piece or story. It is necessary to work out the word to learn about letters and sounds and how words are constructed. Pinnell & Fountas (1998) describe interactive writing as an opportunity to provide text for shared reading and compose text for independent writing. Children are directed to focus on the individual words to promote skill development (sound out, blend, analyze sound and sequence, notice spelling patterns). They are encouraged to generate words, derive words and make links between words and word parts. Children write with the teacher's and their classmates' help. These experiences lead to independent writing, the goal of all writing instruction.

Pinnell and Fountas (1998) in Words Matter state:

> "We find that when children are given a chance to write on their own, they use the skills and strategies that they have been taught in interactive writing...
>
> During independent writing, children construct words, hear and record sounds, use known words to get to words they don't know and notice parts of

> words. You can support children's word solving by planning for these instructional experiences..." (p. 30)

The research findings support that children develop a more positive perception toward literacy when they have experienced interactive writing events. Since literacy-related skills successfully emerge in a social environment, the sociocognitive and sociocultural frameworks embracing the emergent writer are essential component language development. Student and teacher perspectives are also key factors to gains in writing. Collaboration, cooperation and encouragement support progress in writing and, as the students advances in his/her level of security, writing moves toward independence and goal-achievement.

Although much research has been completed, there is a need for more to be completed. The findings indicated that positive perceptions toward writing are recognizable in emergent writers when they have had interactive, sociocultural and collaborative writing experiences, and then move toward independent writing experiences. However, these perceptions are not found as the student moves toward independent writing in the middle and upper grades. There is a need for additional studies to examine what happens, why it happens and what can be done to ensure that future reports of the United States Department of Education do not indicate that four out of ten fourth graders cannot read.

The new "No Child Left Behind" Law of 2001 now holds all educators accountable for each child reaching proficiency by 2014. This is a groundbreaking law for education and demands accountability for teachers and school districts. Never before has accountability been taken to this level. These stronger accountability parameters must pave the way for significant research into teacher training and instructional methodology to provide the students and parents with best practices to ensure high academic performance. Students need to be prepared to meet the challenges in our global society and successful literacy development is essential to accomplishing this goal.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGY

As this literature review has shown, students who have experienced interactive writing events developed more positive attitudes as they moved toward independent writing than those students who had not experienced interactive writing events. The findings indicated that student perspectives influenced literacy development and sociocognitive and sociocultural factors strongly further shaped this development. Students who were actively engaged in collaborative, authentic and cooperative writing events before attempting independent writing tasks were more motivated toward written expression.

One area that needed further investigation was the analysis of student perspectives toward writing and the effect of these perspectives on the relationship of interactive writing and independent writing. This study examined the attitudes of students in an interactive writing classroom and those of students in traditional writing classrooms.

The gains in writing of the students in the control groups (independent writing with no interaction) was compared to those in the experimental group (interactive writing class). Student perspectives toward writing in two consecutive grades (grades one and grade two) were also analyzed and the students' perspectives toward writing were measured in both grades.

METHOD

Participants: The participants in the study consisted of 33 first-graders, 20 males and13 females between the ages of six and seven, and 14 second-graders, 8 males and 6 females between the ages of seven and eight. The school in which this study was conducted is located in Newark, New Jersey and the ethnic mix of the participants is 50% percent African-Americans and 50% Hispanic and Portuguese. The socioeconomic factor is low with more than 50% of the students living in federal assisted housing and 100% of the students qualifying for free lunch. Ninety percent of the students are being raised in single parent homes and forty percent speak English as a second language.

Materials: The materials used were the Fall District Writing Task (Appendix A) administered during the first week of October and the last week of February which consisted of writing a story from a given picture. The students were given a Picture Prompt to tell a story. The stories were scored holistically using the New Jersey Registered Holistic Scoring Rubric, based on a scale of 1 to 6 (Appendix B).

The students were also given a Writing Survey (Appendix C) to determine their perspectives. The examiner modified the Writing Attitude Survey originally published in

the Reading Teacher Vol.54, Sept.2000. Students were asked to circle a Garfield character to elicit pertinent information. Two first grade classes (One control group and one experimental group) and one-second grade class (control group) were given the Writing Survey.

Interactive Writing was performed with the Experimental Group and consisted of the use of charts, markers and fix it tape. The writings and retellings are described in the Procedures section of this study and the samples are noted in Appendix D.

Procedures: In October 2002 both control groups and the experimental group were given the Picture Prompt (District Writing Task) and the tasks were scored on the New Jersey Registered Holistic Scoring Rubric. The first week of December 2002, the writing survey was given to all three classes.

From December 2002 to the end of February 2003, the experimental group engaged in 20 to 30 minutes of daily interactive writing events. These consisted of "sharing the pen" on authentic student interest topics, such as story retellings, making class books, making lists, writing recipes, writing directions, signs, labels, speech bubbles and murals. The teacher prompted the students to initiate a word, sentence or chunk and invited a student to be the scribe. The student "shared the pen" on the interactive chart and composed a text to be constructed and reconstructed by the other students. The responsibility was shifted from the teacher to the student and, as the school year progressed, the shift increased. The students worked collaboratively in a sociocultural environment to assist one another in fixing their mistakes and supporting their learning.

The two control groups engaged in a more traditional writing approach. The writing topics were directed from the teacher leaving no opportunity for student choice. The teacher put starter sentences on the chalkboard and the students were told to write and complete the blanks. The students were given no support from peers, or sources such as word walls, word charts etc. The writing was very independent and there were no prewriting activities to assist the process. In addition, the students were never engaged in interactive writing events.

At the end of February, the students were administered the District Writing Task to be scored holistically (NJRHSR, scale 1-6). The students were also administered the Writing Survey to determine their perspectives on writing.

Data Analysis: Data was collected and compiled. First, the pretest writing surveys and the posttest writing surveys were collected from three classes. A table was constructed with the top row labeled Question # and the side row labeled with the student number. There were sixteen questions on the Writing Survey. The researcher read through each individual student test and put the answer value 1-4 for each question in the table. This procedure was first done with the experimental group for both the pretest and the posttest. The same procedure was done both with the control group #1(second graders) and lastly with the control group #2 (first graders). After the six tables (Appendix E) were constructed for the pre and posttests of the Writing Survey, the rubric scores were then collected and analyzed. Three comparison charts (Appendix F) were constructed in order to compare the pre and posttests using the rubric scores. The student numbers were labeled with the pre and post test rubric scores. The pretest scores were subtracted

from the posttest scores and these scores were used for the Oneway Analysis of Variances (ANOVA).

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine children's perspectives toward writing, the relationship between interactive writing and independent writing and their effect on student performance.

Pretest Rubric scores:
A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.21, SD=1.19), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.27, SD=.88), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.28, SD=.75) on Rubric Scores. The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=4.93$, $p < .05$. The results were further analyzed using Scheffe's post hoc test. The test illustrates that the first graders that didn't use interactive reading had higher Rubric Scores than second graders that didn't use interactive writing ($p < .05$). The test also shows that the first graders who didn't use interactive writing had higher Rubric Scores than first graders that used interactive writing ($p < .05$). - -

Growth Rubric scores:
A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between the growth of first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=1.07, SD=.83), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=.93, SD=.70), and first graders who did use interactive writing (M=2.11, SD=.47). The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=15.51$, $p < .01$.A Scheffe post hoc test shows that the first graders who used interactive writing performed better than first graders who didn't use interactive writing ($p < .01$). The Scheffe post hoc also shows that the first graders who used interactive writing performed better than the second graders who didn't use interactive writing ($p < .01$). –

Pretest Interactive writing experiment:

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.64, SD=.84), second graders who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

didn't use interactive writing (M=3.80, SD=.56), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.39, SD=.78) for question 1, "How would you feel writing a letter to the author of a book you read ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.31$, $p = .279$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.57, SD= 85), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.13, SD=1.06) and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.89, SD=.96) for question 2,"How would you feel if you wrote about something you have heard or seen?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.23$, $p = .301$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.79, SD=1.19), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.40, SD=.74), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.33, SD=1.19) for question 3, "How would you feel writing a letter to a store asking about something you might buy there?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=4.10$, $p < .05$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.50, SD=.65), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.80, SD=.56), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.11, SD=1.18) for question 4, "How would you feel if you were an author who writes books?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=2.57$, $p = .088$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.71, SD=.73), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.93, SD=.26), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.83, SD=.38) for question 5, "How would you feel about becoming an even better writer than you already are?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=.74$, $p = .481$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.93, SD=1.07), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.20, SD=1.27), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.22, SD=1.11) for question 6, "How would you feel about writing a story instead of doing homework?"The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=3.20$, $p = .05$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.07, SD=1.27), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.40, SD=.91), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.11, SD=1.28) for question 7,"How would you feel about writing a story instead of watching TV?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=.35$, $p = .704$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.79, SD=.58), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.73, SD=.59), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.67, SD=1.09) for question 8,"How would you feel writing about something you did in science?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=9.96$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$). There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.71, SD=.61), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.67, SD=.82), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.28, SD=.67) for question 9," How would you feel about checking your writing to make sure the words you have written are spelled correctly ?"The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.92$, $p = .159$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.86, SD=1.17), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.80, SD=.41), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=1.78, SD=1.06) for question 10, "How would you feel if your classmates read something you wrote?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=18.91$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the second graders who didn't use interactive writing ($p<.05$). There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$). There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.21, SD=1.31), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.20, SD=1.21), and first graders who used

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interactive writing (M=1.89, SD=1.23) for question 11, "How would you feel if you didn't write as much in school ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=4.75$, $p < .05$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.14, SD=1.23), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.27, SD=.96), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.50, SD=.99) for question 12, "How would you feel writing about things that have happened in your life ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=.48$, $p = .624$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.36, SD=.84), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.27, SD=1.22), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.89, SD=1.28) for question 13, "How would you feel writing a long story or report at school ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=.77$, $p = .468$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.93, SD=1.21), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.53, SD=.74), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=2.61, SD=1.29) for question 14, "How would you feel if your teacher asked you to go back and change some of your writing?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=2.83$, $p = .070$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=2.71, SD=.91), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.73, SD=.46), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.22, SD=.55) for question 15, "How would you feel if your classmates talked to you about making your writing better ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=8.76$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.50, SD=.86), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=3.87, SD=.35), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=3.72, SD=.58) for question 16, "How would you feel keeping a journal for class?" The effect of group was not statistically significant,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

$F(2,44)=1.29$, $p = .286$.

Growth Interactive writing experiment:

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.64, SD=1.08), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.27, SD=..88), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.11, SD=1.32) for question 1,"How would you feel writing a letter to the author of a book you read?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.77$, $p = .182$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.21, SD=.43), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.27, SD=1.67), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.28, SD=1.07) for question 2, "How would you feel if you wrote about something you have heard or seen ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.09$, $p = .346$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.50, SD=.52), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.53, SD=1.87), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=1.17, SD=1.34) for question 3, "How would you feel writing a letter to a store asking about something you might buy there ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=12.90$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$). There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=.07, SD=.73), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.40, SD=1.18), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.22, SD=1.59) for question 4, "How would you feel if you were an author who writes books ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.06$, $p = ..357$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.36, SD=.74), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.33, SD=.82), and first graders who used interactive writing (M= -.17, SD=.79) for question 5, "How would you feel about becoming an even better writer than you already are ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=.29$, $p = .750$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=.14, SD=.36), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.47, SD=1.25), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.44, SD=1.46) for question 6, "How would you feel about writing a story instead of doing homework ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=2.54$, $p = .090$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.93, SD=1.00), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.33, SD=1.54), and first graders who used interactive writing (M= -.17, SD=.71) for question 7, "How would you feel about writing a story instead of watching TV ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.95$, $p = .154$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.07, SD=.47), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.93, SD=1.22), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.39, SD=1.65) for question 8, "How would you feel writing about something you did in science ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=4.55$, $p < .05$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=.21, SD=.58), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.27, SD=1.22), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.17, SD=.86) for question 9, "How would you feel about checking your writing to make sure the words you have written are spelled correctly ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.23$, $p = .300$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.14, SD=.66), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.53, SD=.92), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.94, SD=1.30) for question 10, "How would you feel if your classmates read something you wrote ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=9.28$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$). There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.36, SD=.93), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.27, SD=1.44), and first graders who used interactive writing (M= -.33, SD=1.19) for question 11, "How would you feel if you didn't write as much in school ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=.02$, $p = .978$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.50, SD=.76), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=.47, SD=1.06), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.22, SD=1.06) for question 12, "How would you feel writing about things that have happened in your life ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=3.80$, $p < .05$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the second graders who didn't use interactive writing ($p<.05$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.29, SD=.83), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M=.13, SD=1.41), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.50, SD=1.42) for question 13, "How would you feel writing a long story or report at school ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.51$, $p = .233$.

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.29, SD=.99), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.80, SD=.94), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.83, SD=1.25) for question 14, "How would you feel if your teacher asked you to go back and change some of your writing ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=9.87$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the first graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.05$). There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did use interactive writing ($p<.01$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.36, SD=.84), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -1.13, SD=1.19), and first graders who used interactive writing (M=.33, SD=.67) for question 15, "How would you feel if your classmates talked to you about making your writing better ?" The effect of group was statistically significant, $F(2,44)=10.48$, $p < .01$. A Scheffe Post Hoc test was performed to see which groups were significant. There was significance between the second graders who didn't use interactive writing and the first graders who did

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

use interactive writing ($p<.01$).

- A Oneway ANOVA was used to see if there was a difference between first graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.36, SD=1.45), second graders who didn't use interactive writing (M= -.73, SD=1.16), and first graders who used interactive writing (M= -.11, SD=.76) for question 16, "How would you feel keeping a journal for class ?" The effect of group was not statistically significant, $F(2,44)=1.25$, $p = .296$.

DISCUSSION

This study showed evidence that children maintain a more positive perception of writing when they have the initial opportunity to collaboratively write and express feeling through another person's experiences, in addition to their own experiences. Children who are moved toward written expression after they have collaboratively shared experiences and constructed written pieces develop a more creative and free style of written expression than those children who are singly assigned a written task. The collaboration with the teacher and classmates allowed the child to be prepared socially, emotionally and cognitively for language development.

The findings in this study showed evidence that the experimental group performed significantly better than both control groups on the writing tasks. The experimental group achieved significantly higher growth from the pre-test to the post-test. This evidence indicated that children's writing improved when the instruction and the events were scaffolded to their individual needs and interests.

One interesting observation resulted from question #10 on the Writing Survey, "How would you feel if your classmates read something you wrote?" The students in the experimental group were significantly more receptive to share their writings with their classmates since they were accustomed to interactive writing events. These experiences provided opportunities for the students to share writing activities.

Another question also supported these findings. Question #15, "How would you feel if your classmates talked to you about making your writing better?" indicated that the experimental group produced significantly higher growth after the intervention of interactive events. The group communicated an eagerness to participate in an interactive environment.

The results of the above two questions are compelling. The literature review indicated that the use of interactive writing activities also promoted use of metacognitive language. This metacognitive reflection contributed to the achievement as previous research indicated. Another significant condition is that children were eager to take the risk of making a mistake. The original research by Fountas and Pinnell (1998) indicated that "sharing the pen" technique allowed children to become problem-finders and problem-solvers. Children were willing to share their writings, as they were accustomed to self and peer assessment. Their feelings were not hurt when they made a mistake and this interaction shaped how children perceived their own progress.

After implementing this study, some limitations were obvious. Control group #1 had a substitute teacher for three weeks. They were denied consistent instruction since the general classroom teacher was absent for this time period. Another limitation was the timeframe of the study. If the intervention were done for a full academic year, the results may have shown higher growth in written expression and stronger attitudes in positive perceptions.

The study was limited to an urban elementary school. If the study were conducted in a suburban elementary school, it would be interesting to measure the growth in written expression within two groups with comparable social and cognitive experiences.

To further investigate children's perspectives on interactive writing and their relationship to independent writing, a study following the groups from grade one through grade four would be powerful. These results would further support the analysis of a grade level as they would transition from emergent writing to independent writing. A study of this nature would be distinct in supporting interactive writing as a preliminary phase of all writing instruction. It would also be specific to increased performance in writing as a result of a combination of cognitive, social, metacognitive skill development. It would be interesting to measure the experimental group's ability to write independently to a variety of audiences.

References

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1987). The psychology of written composition. Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.

Berninger, V., Vaughn, K., Abbot, R.D., Begay, Coleman, K. Curin, K.,Graham, S. & Hawkins, J. M. (2002). Teaching spelling and composition alone and together: Implications for the simple view of writing. Journal of Educational Psychology, 94 (2), 291-304.

Bickel, D., Holsopple, S., Garcia, P., Lantz, M. J. & Yoder, D. (1999). Relationship of Interactive Writing to Independent Writing in Kindergarten and First Grade. ERIC Digest.

Bissex, G. (1980) GNYS AT WORK: A child learn to read and write. Cambridge Harvard University.

Bloodgood, Janet W. (1999). What's in a name: Children's name writing and literacy Acquisition. Reading Research Quarterly, 34, 342-266.

Bouffard, H. M., Vezeau, C., Boisvert, M. & Dumas, C. (1998). British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 321-330.

Braaksma, M., Bijlaarsdam, G., & can den Bergh, H., (2002). Observational Learning and the Effects of Model-Observer Similarity. Journal of Educational Psychology. 94, (2), 405-415.

Bradley, D. H. (2001). How beginning writers articulate and demonstrate their understanding of the act of writing. Reading Research and Instruction, 40 (4), 273-294.

Brandt. L. Interactive Writing: A Study of Sociocultural Relations, Retreived July 22, 2002 from www.coe.ohio.state.edu.

Brabham, E. G. & Villaume, S. K. (2001). Building walls of words. The Reading Teacher, 54, (7), 700-702.

Button, K. Johnson, M. J., & Furgerson, P. (March 1996). Interactive writing in a primary classroom. The Reading Teacher, 49, (6), 45-53.

Clay, M. M. (1975). What did I write? Auckland, New Zealand: Heinmann.

Clay, M. M. (1991). Becoming literate: The construction of inner control. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinmann.

Cunningham, P. (2000) Phonics they use: Words for reading and writing. New York: Longman Press.

Cunningham, P., & Hall, D. P. (1998). Month-by-month phonics. Greensboro, North Carolina: Carmen-Dellaosa.

Daiute, C. & Dalton, B. (1993). Collaboration between children learning to write: can novices be masters? Cognition and Instruction 10, 281-333.

Daiute, C., Hartup, W., Sholl, W. and Zajac, R. (March 1993). Peer collaboration and written language development: a study of friends and acquaintances. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Devries & Zanstate (as cited in Brandt Lisa J. study 2002)

Dorn, L. J., French, C. & Jones, T. (1998) Apprenticeship in literacy. York, Maine, Stenhouse Publishing.

Duthie, C. (1994). Nonfiction: A genre study for the primary classroom. Language Arts, 71, 588-595.

Englert, C. & Raphael, T. (1988). Constructing well-formed prose: Process, structure and Metacognitive knowledge. Exceptional Children, 54 (6), 513-520.

Ferreiro, E. & Teberosky, A. (1982). Literacy before school. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Ferreiro, E. (1984). The underlying logic of literacy development. In H. Goelman, A. A. Oberg, & F. Smith (Eds.) New directions in the study of reading (pp 154-173). Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinmann.

Ferreiro, E. (1985a). Literacy development: A psycholinguistic perspective. In D. R. Olson, N. Torrance, & A. Hildyard (Eds.). Literacy, language and learning, (pp 217-228). Cambridge: England: Cambridge University Press.

Ferreiro, E. (1985b). The relationship between oral and written language: The children's viewpoints. In M. M. Clark (Ed.). New directions in the study of reading, (pp.83-94). London: Falmer Press.

Flower, L. S. (1989). Problem-solving strategies for writing (3rd ed.). Chicago, Illinois: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ford, M. P. & Optiz, F. (May 2002). Using centers to engage children during guided reading time: intensifying learning experiences away from the teacher. The Reading Teacher, 55, 710-717.

Fosnot (1996) (as cited in Brandt, Lisa J. study, 2002).

Fresch, M. J. (February 2000). Journal entries as a window on spelling knowledge. The Reading Teacher, 54, 500-513.

Glasswell, K. (December 2001). Matthew Effects in writing: The pattrerning of difference in writing classrooms K-7. Reading Research Quarterly, 36 (4), 348-349.

Graves, A. W., Valles, E., &Rueda, R. (2002) Variations in interactive writing instruction:a study in four bilingual special education settings. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, (15).

Graves, D. (1983) Writing: Teacher and child at work. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinmann.

Graves, D. (1994) A fresh look at writing. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinmann.

Guillaume, A. M. (1998) Learning with text in the primary grades. The Reading Teacher, 51, 476-486.

Hall, Nigel. (2000). Interactive writing with young children. Childhood Education. International Focus, (76).

Hardy, P. S. (1982). Process, product and concepts about writing. A study of sixteen Children ages three through six (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Women's University, Denton, Texas (1981). Dissertation Abstracts International 42/08, 35604A.

Hayes, J. & Flower, L. (1986). Writing research and the writer. American Psychologist, 41, 1106-1113.

Henry, J. & Wiley, B. J. (1999). Answers to Frequently Asked Questions About Interactive Writing. ERIC Digest.

International Reading Association and National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1998). Learning to read and write: Developmentally appropriate practices for young children. The Reading Teacher, 52, 193-216.

Jones, Ithel. (1998). Peer relationships and writing development: a microgenetic analysis. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 229-241.

Jones, I. & Pellegrini, A. D. (1996). The effects of social relationships, writing media And microgenetic development on first-grade students' written narratives. American Educational Research Journal, 33, 691-718.

Kear, D. J., Coffman, G.A., McKenna, M. C. & Ambrosio, A. I. (September 2000). Measuring Attitude Toward Writing: A New Tool for Teachers." The Reading Teacher, 54, 10-24.

Lu, M. Y. Writing Development. (2000) ERIC 159.

Mahiri, Jabari & Godley, A. (December 1998). Rewriting identity: Social meanings of literacy and re-visions of self. Reading Research Quarterly 33 (4), 416-434.

McAlister, K. M., Nelson, N. W., Bahr, C. M. (1999). Perceptions of students with language and learning disabilities about writing process instruction. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 3, (4).

McCarrier, S., Pinnell, Gay Su & Fountas, I. C. (2000). Interactive writing. Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Heinmann.

Page-Voth, Victoria & Graham, Steve. (1999). Effects of goal setting and strategy use

on the writing performance and self-efficacy of students with writing and learning problems. Journal of Educational Psychology. 91, (2), 230-240.

Pellegrini, A. D., Galda, L. & Flor, D. (1997). Relationships, individual differences, and children's use of literate language. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67, 139-152.

Piaget, J. (1983). Piaget's theory. In W. Kessen (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology, 1, (pp.103-128). New York: Wiley.

Pinnell, G. S. & Fountas, I. C. (1998) Word matters. Portsmouth, NH: Heinmann.

Richgels, D. J. (2002). Informational texts in kindergarten. The Reading Teacher 55, 586-595.

Rubadue, M. (2002). Sharing the pen. Teaching K-8, 58-59.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C. & Goelman, H. (1980). The role of production factors In writing ability. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), What writers know: The language process and structure of written discourse, (pp.173-210), New York: Academic Press.

Snow, C. (Ed.). (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. US Department of Education Summit. Commissioned by the National Research Council (NCR) Washington, D. C.

Vygotsky, L. (1978) Mind in society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1962) Thought and language. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.) (1985). Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wiencek, B. J., Vazzano, J. &. Reizian, S. (1999-01). Balanced literacy in a first grade classroom: pactices, tensions, and potentials. Education Digest 435-972.

Wollman-Bonilla, Julie E. (2001). Can first-grade writers demonstrate audience awareness? Reading Research Quarterly, 36,(2), 184-200.

Yarrow, Fiona & Topping, Keith J. (2001). Collaborative writing: The effects of Metacognitive prompting and structured peer interaction. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 712, 261-282.

APPENDIX

WRITING ASSESSMENT FOR GRADE 1-2

Writing Samples

Teachers will collect three (3) consecutive writing samples from each child in the class and score these sets of writing using the primary version of the Registered Holistic Scoring Method Rubric. This collection of student work helps to tell the story of the student's learning. It is meant to provide authentic data on which to assess progress, show what a child knows about the processes of writing and spelling; identify particular strengths and instructional needs of individual children; and influence instructional decisions, the selection of resources and teaching strategies.

TEST ADMINISTRATION FORMAT

Whole class: students select pictures individually and write individual responses. Adequate time should be allowed for students to write a story about their selected pictures on 3 consecutive days of writing or 3 days within a single week.

MATERIALS

Grade-appropriate lined paper
Pencil/marker
Pictures
Primary Registered Holistic Scoring Rubric
Class Data Sheets

ADMINISTRATION

Be sure each child writes his or her name and the date on each of the writing samples.

On each of the three (3) days of assessment:

- Allow each child to select a picture and provide him/her with grade-appropriate lined paper.
    - **Say: A picture can tell a story. Select a picture that you would like to use to help you tell a story. After you have selected your picture, you may return to your seat and begin writing.**
- At his or her seat, the child is instructed to write a story.
- If assistance is necessary, the teacher may prompt a child through discussion to help generate ideas.
- The writing should be collected when the student is finished. As writing samples are part of an instructional program, an appropriate time limit would reflect individual student's abilities and needs.
- In order to generate three (3) writing samples for assessment, this process should be repeated two more times. The entire process should be completed within one week, preferably on three consecutive days.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Registered Holistic Scoring Method for K-2 Students

Criteria/Score	4	5	6
LANGUAGE LEVEL	Sentence (Any Simple Sentence)	Punctuated Story (Of 2 Or More Sentences)	Paragraphed Story (Extended Elaboration)
MESSAGE QUALITY	Uses Repetitive, Independent Sentence Patterns Like: "Here Is A ..."	Attempts To Record Own Ideas, Often Independently In Standard Written Language.	Conveys His/Her Own Ideas To Produce A Successfully Sustained Composition That May Be Read Independently By An Audience.
DIRECTIONAL PRINCIPLES	Correct Directional Pattern.	Correct Directional Pattern & Spaces Between Words.	Text Without Any Difficulties Of Arrangement and Spacing.
SPELLING & USAGE	Invented Spelling/Usage Consonant Spelling & Vowels. Long Vowels Are Spelled More Accurately Than Short Vowels. Combination Of Scribbles, Invented & Correct Spellings Conventional Usage.	Invented/Standard Spelling/Usage. Invented Spellings. Self-Corrections. Invented Spellings & Conventional Usage.	Invented/Standard Spelling/Usage. Transfers From Invented Spellings To More Standard Spellings. Uses Correct Spelling & Conventional Usage.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



BEST COPY AVAILABLE



BEST COPY AVAILABLE



BEST COPY AVAILABLE



BEST COPY AVAILABLE



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Experimental Pretest

Student #	Question #															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	3	4	2	1	3	1	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	3	3
2	4	3	1	2	4	3	3	1	4	1	1	4	4	1	3	3
3	4	2	3	4	4	2	1	1	2	4	4	4	3	1	4	3
4	3	4	4	3	4	2	1	2	4	3	2	3	4	1	3	2
5	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	3	2	4
6	4	3	1	4	4	1	4	2	4	3	1	1	3	4	3	4
7	3	4	3	4	4	4	1	2	3	2	4	4	3	4	3	4
8	3	4	2	1	3	4	4	2	3	1	2	4	1	4	3	4
9	4	2	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	3	4
10	1	2	4	3	4	1	4	3	4	2	4	1	1	2	3	4
11	3	3	2	1	4	1	4	4	3	1	1	4	3	1	3	4
12	3	2	1	4	4	3	4	2	3	2	1	4	4	2	3	4
13	4	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	3	1	2	4	4	2	3	4
14	4	3	1	4	4	2	4	3	3	2	1	4	1	2	3	4
15	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	2	4	4	4	1	4	4	4
16	3	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	4	4
17	4	1	1	4	4	1	1	3	4	1	1	4	4	4	4	4
18	4	2	4	3	3	2	4	3	3	1	2	4	4	3	4	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Experimental Post Test

	Question #															
Student #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	1	3	3	1	3	3
2	4	2	3	3	4	4	1	4	4	2	1	3	1	4	3	3
3	2	1	3	4	4	4	1	4	1	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	3	4	4	1	3	4	4	4	4
5	2	4	3	1	2	4	3	1	3	1	1	3	1	3	2	4
6	4	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
7	4	4	4	3	4	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	3	4
8	4	2	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	1	3	3	4	3	4
9	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	1	4	1	1	4	3	4	4	4
10	4	3	4	3	4	1	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4
11	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4
12	3	2	4	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	1	4	4	2	4	3
13	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	4	4	4
14	3	4	4	2	3	3	4	3	4	1	1	4	3	2	4	3
15	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
16	4	4	4	3	4	1	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	2
17	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	4	4
18	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4

Control Group #1 Pre Test

	Question #															
Student #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	4	1	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	1	3	3	4	1	3	4
2	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	3	4
3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	3	4
4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	1	4	3	1	4	4
5	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	4	3	4	3	4
6	4	1	2	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	2	4
7	1	2	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	4
8	4	3	1	4	4	3	2	4	4	1	4	1	3	3	2	4
9	3	2	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	2	1	3	3	2	1	4
10	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
11	3	2	4	3	4	3	1	4	4	2	2	3	3	4	3	3
12	4	3	1	3	2	3	1	4	3	2	4	4	4	2	4	3
13	4	3	4	2	4	2	4	3	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	3
14	4	4	1	4	4	1	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	2	2	3

Control Group #1 Post Test

Student #	Question # 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	1	1	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	1	3	2	4	1	2	4
2	4	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	1	3	4	4	3	4
3	3	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	1	3	4	4	2	4
4	3	2	2	4	2	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	3	1	3	4
5	4	3	3	3	2	4	2	4	4	3	1	4	1	2	2	4
6	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	1	3	2	3	2
7	1	2	1	4	4	2	1	3	4	3	2	3	4	4	2	4
8	4	3	1	4	4	3	2	4	4	1	1	1	4	2	3	1
9	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	2	1	4	1	1	1	4
10	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	4
11	4	2	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	2	1	2	3	4	3	1
12	4	2	1	3	2	3	1	4	3	2	4	2	4	2	4	2
13	3	3	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	3	1	4	3	2	2	4
14	4	4	1	3	4	2	1	3	4	4	2	1	1	4	1	2

Control Group #2 PreTest

	Question #															
Student #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	4	3	3	4	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3
2	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3
3	4	1	3	2	4	1	1	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
4	4	1	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4
5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	4	1	4	3	4	4	4
6	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4
7	4	3	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
8	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	4	4	4
9	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
10	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
11	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
12	2	3	2	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	1	1	4	3	4
13	4	3	4	4	3	1	4	2	4	3	3	2	4	3	3	4
14	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	3	4
15	4	2	3	4	4	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	1	2	3	4

Control Group #2 PostTest

	Question #															
Student #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	4	3	1	2	2	1	4	1	1	2	3	4	3	3	2	1
2	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	1
3	4	4	2	4	4	1	4	2	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	1
4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	4
5	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	4
6	4	1	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	2	3	4
7	4	1	4	4	4	1	3	1	4	2	1	4	4	1	1	4
8	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	1	4
9	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	1
10	3	3	4	2	4	2	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3
11	4	3	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4
12	2	3	3	4	4	2	1	3	4	4	3	4	1	2	3	4
13	4	2	3	4	4	3	4	1	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	4
14	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4
15	4	3	2	4	3	4	2	4	4	3	2	4	4	2	1	4

Rubric Scores

Experimental Group

Student #	October (Pre)	February (Post)
1	2	4
2	1	2
3	2	4
4	2	4
5	2	5
6	3	5
7	2	4
8	3	5
9	3	6
10	2	4
11	3	5
12	3	5
13	3	5
14	1	3
15	3	5
16	2	5
17	1	3
18	3	5

Rubric Scores

Control Group #1

Student #	October (Pre)	February (Post)
1	3	4
2	2	4
3	3	5
4	4	4
5	4	5
6	3	5
7	4	4
8	2	4
9	5	5
10	2	4
11	4	5
12	5	5
13	1	2
14	3	4

Rubric Scores

Control Group #2

Student #	October (Pre)	February (Post)
1	2	3
2	4	5
3	2	2
4	3	5
5	3	5
6	3	5
7	2	2
8	1	2
9	3	4
10	1	1
11	1	2
12	3	3
13	2	3
14	2	3
15	2	3

ERIC/RCS
2805 East Tenth St.
Bloomington, IN 47405

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS 511 928

REPRODUCTION RELEASE (Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION

Title: Children's Perspectives on Interactive Writing vs. Independent Writing in Primary Grades

Author(s): Carla Cicalese

Corporate Source (if appropriate): _____ Publication Date: April 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche and paper copy (or microfiche only) and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the options and sign the release below.

CHECK HERE ➧ ☑ Microfiche (4" x 6" film) and paper copy (8½" x 11") reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

(PERSONAL NAME OR ORGANIZATION AS APPROPRIATE)

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OR ☐ Microfiche (4" x 6" film) reproduction only

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

(PERSONAL NAME OR ORGANIZATION AS APPROPRIATE)

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed in both microfiche and paper copy.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction of microfiche by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

SIGN HERE ➧

Signature: Carla Cicalese Printed Name: Carla Cicalese

Organization: Kean University Position: Masters / Thesis

Address: 7 Carol Court Tel. No.: (908) 276-7814

Cranford, NJ Zip Code: 07016 Date: April 2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (Non-ERIC Source)

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: _____

Address: _____

Price Per Copy: _____ Quantity Price: _____

IV. REFERRAL TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

_____

_____